SOME

[illegible]ous Reflections

On that Part of

M[illegible]BPNIONS

[illegible] of Faith

TOUCHING

[illegible] Communion

WITH

Unbaptized Persons:

[illegible]S ALSO

[illegible]rguments against the [illegible]ce, and Seven Queries [illegible] the Author.

[illegible] of Christ & the Church.

[illegible] that is first in his own cause [illegible] just, but his Neighbour cometh and [illegible]meth him.

[illegible] 11 13 14. For it was not an Ene[illegible] [illegible] approached me, then I could have [illegible] &c.

[illegible] 2. 94. [illegible].

[illegible]. Printed for Francis Smith, at the [illegible] and Castle near the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, and at the same sign the first Shop without Temple-Bar. 1675.

...eous Reader,

...ere is presented to thy ...erious Consideration, some observations upon a late Book, ...ntitulled, *The Confession of Faith*, of J. B. Wherein that Author declareth his Faith conserning Church Fellowship, and the way of entrance therein: Endeavouring, after his manner, to prove that Men and Women that believe in Jesus Christ, although not Baptized with water, may be Members of any

perticular Church of [illegible]
ought to be admitted to
Lords Supper, and all oth
Church Ordinances; A Doctri
not known or practised in the
first Gospel Churches, or by a
ny others of whatperswasi
ever, that have profess
Christian Faith, since that tim
to this very age: as for
practice of the Churches
Primative times, the Scripture
is in no one thing plainer then
in this, that all Persons before
they were added to the Church,
were Baptized with Water;
which appeareth both by the
Comission given by Jesus Christ,
Mat. 28, 19. and the Practise
of the Apostles, *Act.* 2, 38, 39.
Which is more at large shewed
in this Treatise: I suppose the

Author

who himself is against
ne Baptizing of Children, and
or the Baptizing of Believers,
n their profession of Faith in
ist, makes it none of the least
his Arguments, why he is a-
t Childrens Baptism, then
viz. that there being no
residents or example in
iptures for Childrens
, therefore Children
ought not to be Baptized. If this
Argument be good (as I believe
it is) that causeth him to forsake
the practice of Baptizing Chil-
dren; why should it not be as
good at least to him in the case
in hand? but to cause in him the
same belief, that none ought to
be admitted to the Lords Sup-
per, but such as are Baptized
with Water, seeing there cannot

be shown any Precept re
or Example in the Scriptures
that any Unbaptized-person we
ever admitted to the Lords S
per; for the Scriptures alle
by him, and some Consequen
drawn therefrom to the c
ry, if they be seriously co
ed by the Reader, they
a great deal of bould nd
confidence of his own, but a-
ny thing to the matter, to prove
what they are brought for; but
it is very usual for such persons
who have not the truth with
them, to fill their Writings with
their own confidences, that so
they may induce a belief in o-
thers, of the things they assert
from their own Authority. The
severe Charges laid by him a-
gainst those that are contrary
minded,

ged, if true, would be ſuffi-
nt to frighten them into his
erſwaſion, but we paſs not for
mans judgement, knowing that
e which judgeth us is the Lord,
who will bring the hidden
ings of darkneſs to light, all
plead for is, that all that pro-
ſeſs themſelves to be Chriſti-
ans, ſhould walk according to
the Primative pattern, and in
this matter we are ſure we fol-
low none other but the foot-
ſteps of the Flock of Chriſt in
all ages.

We would appeal to the con-
ſcience of this Appoſer, whe-
ther the Arguments publiſhed
by many for Baptizing of chil-
dren, have not more force in
them, and of greater Antiquity
(although in our judgements

ſhort of proof) then any that is Writ by him, to p[rove] the lawfulneſs of any to rec[eive] the Lords Supper that is not firſt Baptized with Water. I ſhall ſay nothing of the great contempt caſt by him upon Water Baptiſm, but deſire the Lord may humble him for it; Wiſdom is juſtified of her children.

I deſire to Honour and Reverence thoſe many faithful Chriſtians that differ from us, who notwithſtanding value this Ordinance of Chriſt, only miſtake in the ſubject, and are far from placing Religion only in this or any other inſtitution of Chriſt; but finding the Scriptures ſhew no other Rule in the Order of inſtituted Worſhip, then upon be-

believing, to be first Baptized, then added to the Church, we dare not be wise above what is Written.

Communion with all Saints, in all things, is a desireable thing, and not the least part of that Glory which will for ever be injoyed in Heaven, and it would be a blessed thing, if while Christians differ in their light, the best knowing but in part, it might be maid up by an increase of love, this would convince the World they were Christs Disciples indeed; but care must be had in the first place, to observe the Rules given by our great Lord, and to walk according to them, and not for Communion sake to leap over the Order Jesus Christ

hath Prescribed in his Word; I shall not trouble thee any longer; but commend the consideration of the matter Insuing to thy serious Thoughts, and the blessing of that God who is able to cause all Grace and Truth to abound in thy Soul.

Thine in the Lord,

W. K.

Sir,

Sir,

YOur *Confession of Faith* I have viewed, and have reviewed that part which respects Church Communion with Unbaptized persons: should all of your rank, take occasion to tell the World what they do, and do not believe or practice, it might give them more imployment then they can or need to attend: I should little have troubled my self, to take notice of the rest of your offers, in your Confession, had you not under the head before expressed, shewed your self so bold to assert that which is yet unproved; neither should I have medled with the controversie at all, had I

had I found any, of parts, that would divert themselves from more weighty occasions, to take notice of you; but since you are so willing to be known in the World, by your Singular Faith, it is my liberty, as well as others, into whose hands it falls, to weigh what you have said, in truths ballance: and if it be found too light, to reject it whether you will or no. Though I love not Controversies, yet Truth must not be lost.

Now Sir, for your Ten Arguments, for your practice; with the Eighteen Absurdities, drawn from the Principle or Practice of them that are contrary minded; wherein you insult over them, as Babes foolish, yea Beasts, if not Men, as you seem proudly and imperiously to assert: You by your fixing of these absurdities upon this innocent Principle and Practice, do not contend your self to degrade all the

Baptized

Baptized Brethren, of this perſwaſion; but with too much impudence, do Render them amongſt the worſt of men, meddling with the very Secrets of the moſt High, which are ſo much out of your reach, that you have rendred them that oppoſe your Principle, to be the cauſe of the Deaths of thoſe Hundreds of Thouſands that have fallen by Gods Judgements in theſe late years; one of the moſt Prodigiouſeſt Sentence that ever I heard paſs from the Mouth, or fall under the Pen of the worſt of Truths Enemies, as though nothing ſhort, in your rage, would ſerve you then to defie all the Brethren of the Baptized way, and *Blaſpheam* them that dwell in Heaven. I ſhall orderly touch at theſe things as I go along.

Your great noiſe about an Initiating Ordinance, wherein you ſpend time enough, I ſhall take no notice of, I know none that aſſert it to

be

be the Inlet into perticuler Churches, though it prepares them for Reception: It's consent ON all hands, and nothing else, that makes them Members of this or that perticuler Church, and not Faith and Baptism.

You are pleased in the general, before you come to *your* Arguments, to call in several Scriptures to support your practice, which your self do acknowledge are not direct to the purpose, as *Acts* 9. 25, 26, 27. 1 *Cor.* 16 10. 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. Which you confess respects the receiving them as Officers: is there no difference between the receiving of the one, and of the other? must *Phebees* case, and others of the like nature, be brought in to patronize your Practice, when there is nothing in them that respects the matter in Controversie. Were any of these Unbaptized persons? say it if you dare. Sure it is a bad Cause, that

that must be upheld by such foraign and remote shifts: besides, what need *Paul* plead for the Vindication of himself, or others? that he was Baptized, when your self acknowledge that Baptism immediately after Conversion, was the known practice of the first Christians; which none in those times did so much as question, therefore no need to plead that, but his Conversation in those things, about which the false Apostles, or other, might injustly tax him.

You start a Question, *Page* 70. by what rule Persons are to be received. And Answer, by a discovery of their Faith and Holiness, and Willingness to subject to all Christs Laws. And pray you tell me, is obeying Baptism, no part of a Christians Holiness? is Baptism none of the Laws of Christ, the Lawgiver? must this, with others have no place of discovery? but must it

it altogether be ſhut out from being a witneſs to the truth of Faith; if it muſt, lets know by what rule, for we ſhall not take your word, but by holineſs. I perceive you mean only a walking, according to the Moral precept, *which with Faith in Chriſt* is ſufficient to make a *Church-Member*, ſo that I perceive *Moſes* is more beholden to you then Chriſt; the Servant then the Son, if *Moſes* Law in his Moral precepts, be the onely bounds of a Chriſtians Holineſs or Sanctification, under the Goſpel, for what end, then are all thoſe Goſpel-Commands, eſpecially inſtructed Worſhip, they are in your ſenſe of little uſe to us: obedience to them doth not add to our Holineſs, therefore a breach of them, by that rule, muſt be no part of our ſin.

But you tell us, *Page* 93. None ever received Baptiſm, without light

light in it: I grant it, they never received it aright, which is a clear Argument, that the persons you plead for, for Church-fellowship, never received it at all, because they could not then have light in it when they were sprinkled, and therefore ought to repent and be ashamed of that abomination, before they come to have a sight of the pattern of the House of God, the goings in, and comings out thereof, *Ezek.* 43. 10, 11.

2. Is it a Persons light, that gives being to a Precept? is it not his sin, though he want light? he that knew not his Masters will was beaten, because it is like he had means to know it, though he was ignorant.

3. Suppose men plead want of light in other Commands, must they be excused? what if a man want light in the Supper after he's in the Church, or in Church-Government, and therefore thinks not himself

ſelf accountable for his Converſation to men, but God: or what if a man want light in his Duty to the poor, and thinks it enough to bid his brother be fed, and be cloathed, though he give little for his relief: Perhaps he may give Two Pence, when according to what he hath, he ought to give Twelve Pence? Why may not want of Light, excuſe theſe men from being rejected out of Churches, as well as want of light makes way for Unbaptized to come in? But perhaps you will ſay, theſe are Moral evils, and they ſin againſt men, well, let it be ſo: but I remember what Old *Samuel* ſaid to his Sons, 1 *Sam.* 2. 25. *if one Man ſin againſt another, the Judge ſhall plead for him, but if a man ſin againſt the Lord, who ſhall plead for him?* But we have now found an Advocate for Sin againſt God, in the breach of One of his Holy Commands: when ſin againſt the Law of God, that

wrongs

wrongs the poor shall not go free.

You are pleased to tell us, that same Object, *Page* 86. against your Proofs, out of the Epistles, because they were Writ to perticular Churches: and indeed, I am one of those same, to which you Answer, that some of them, as the first Epistle of *Corinth.* and some others named, were not so directed, but to perticular Saints, as well as Churches.

I answer, I think that will be difficult for you to prove: For it is apparent, the matter of those Epistles did respect Churches, and those Churches in special to whom Directed (though of use to all Saints) as I might easily demonstrate: But sir, pray you tell us, in your next, whether any of those you mean, were Unbaptized beleivers, that were concerned in those Epistles: forasmuch as you confess, in those times Baptism followed immediately.

diately upon Conversion: if th
were not Unbaptized Believers,
is without our question, for *Pa*
might Write to them as well
Timothy and others, that they mig
know how to behave themselves
the House of God.

You also say, *Page* 16. If Wat
Baptism as other things, pester t
Church as of Old, trouble the pea
wound the Conscience of the Go
ly, dismember and break their fe
lowships, though an Ordinance, it
prudently to be shunned.

I answer, it's very boldly offere
who gave you liberty to shun Tru
for Peace; But you hint, the Churc
hath of old been pestted with Bap
tism, and therefore when it is so,
may prudently be shunned. I confes
if ever you find Baptism a Pest o
Plague to Churches, all men wi
shun the Plague: is this the be
Title you can give to one o
Christs Commands? did God ever

send

end an Ordinance, as a Peſt and Plague to his People? are not all the Ordinances of the Goſpel, Bleſſings, yea, New Covenant Bleſſings? is there any thing in the nature of Innocent Baptiſm, to Peſter Churches, or do they Peſter Churches that plead for it, or they that deny it? but the Conſciences of the Godly, you ſay, are wounded, the Churches Peace broken, their fellowſhip diſmembred, and what then? Suppoſe theſe effects follow perſons oppoſing other Ordinances, muſt they be ſhunned, to avoid the effects? I have in my time known Godly Conſcientious perſons Diſmember Fellowſhips, break the Peace of Churches, by makeing Preaching by Method, Doctrine, Reaſon, and Uſe, to be Antichriſtian; who could not be ſatisfied in their Conſciences, as they ſaid, unleſs the great Ordinance of thus Preaching, was exploded,

ploded, and some thing like Conference brought in the room. I have known persons make a Sacrifice of the peace of Churches, for putting the Administration of breaking Bread upon perticuler persons, by Church-appointment, and not leaveing it promisciously amongst the Gifted Brethren, as each of them was Free; and these as exact Moralists in their lives, and as Holy in their Conversations, as any of your Unbaptized persons, that you so highly extoll above others, to be the Honour and Crown of Churches; and must the Church for peace sake shun these Great Appointments of Preaching and Breaking Bread, rather then Grieve the Consciences of these Godly ones? though it was no part of their Godliness to make such Breaches, neither is it for any of those you plead for, to deny Baptism, how Godly so-

ſoever they may be in other things: if this be your Prudence or Wiſdom, to ſhake hands with Truth and Purity, for peace, the Lord deliver me from ſuch a Fellowſhip; This Wiſdom is from beneath and not from above.

Your Second Argument is taken from *Epheſians* 4. *One Spirit, one Hope, one Faith, one Baptiſm*: This Baptiſm, you ſay, is not of Water, but the Spirit.

I Anſwer, I ſee rather then you will miſs your end in ſaying ſomething, you care not if your Pen be imployed againſt every man, and you give the lye to all Expoſitors beſides your ſelf (as I know of) if this be Spirit Baptiſm. Pray you tell me what you mean by Spirit Baptiſm: if you mean the work of the Spirit in Converſion, I grant Converſion is the Spirits Work; but where Converſion barely without extraordinary

gifts

gifts, is called the Baptism of the Spirit, I am in a readiness to learn, if you can teach me, but why must this Baptism not be Water Baptism, if Water Baptism be a Truth, the Spirit leadeth into this Truth, as well as others: if *Paul* intended Spirit Baptism, in this place, as the last thing he urgeth upon them, for Union; what doth he mean by Spirit and Faith, which are urged before by him, as Arguments? can Persons have the Spirit, without the Fruits of the Spirit? Why doth not *Paul* put Spirit again, in the place of Baptism, according to your sense, who are pleased to make him speaking one and the same thing, in his First and Last Arguments? though the one he calls Spirit, and the other Baptism.

Sir, I list not to contend about this, but leave you to Answer those Expositors that have in all their writings made this, Water Baptism.

Farther,

Farther, if nothing but extraordinary gifts be called the Baptiſm of the Spirit, in a ſtrickt ſence, then that Baptiſm, 1 *Cor.* 12. muſt be water Baptiſm, as well as this in *Epheſians* 4. and then your Argument from both is void.

Your Third Argument is, That theſe you plead for, have the Doctrine of Baptiſmes; in which you are pleaſed to diſtinguiſh between the Doctrine, and the Practice: this is one of the ſtrangeſt Paradoxes that I have lightly obſerved; is it enough to hold practical Doctrines, to know them ſo as to hold them, and yet not do them? You need never ask a believer whether he hold a practical Doctrine, his obedience to it will always ſpeak for him: But I pray you how came theſe Unbaptized perſons to have the Doctrine of Baptiſm? Why? the Doctrine of Baptiſm, you ſay, is the death of Chriſt, his Reſurrection; and the

believers intereſt in both, to newneſs of life. I confeſs that Chriſt's death and reſurrection, and our intereſt in both, is ſignified by Baptiſm; but that that was, or ought to be called the Doctrine of Baptiſm, I am yet to learn: Verily, I took the Doctrine of Baptiſm to be the Command, that a believer ought to be baptized in Chriſt's Name, for ſuch ends which the Goſpel expreſſes; I never took the death Chriſt, nor the reſurrection, to be the Doctrine of Baptiſm: if the Reſurrection be the Doctrine of Baptiſm, why doth the Apoſtle make that, and the Doctrine of Baptiſmes diſtinct in *Hebrews 6.* which you cote.

2. Under the Law all the Sacrifices of that diſpenſation with their Sabaths and other things, were Tipes of that Chriſt who was the ſubſtance of all thoſe Ceremonies: If any of them then that profeſſed Faith in the *Meſſiah* to come, ſhould upon ſcruples,

ſcruples, or want of pretended light, neglect the whole, or part of that Tipical Worſhip, why may not a man ſay of them, as this advocate ſays of the practice under debate? They had the richer and better Sacrifice, they had the ſubſtance and body of all the Tipes: So that this principle puts the whole of Gods inſtituted Worſhip, both under Law and Goſpel, to the higheſt uncertainties; & it is ſo indifferently commended to men for their practice, that the holineſs or good that is in it, is by the Author ſo indefernable, that he can hardly fix upon any thing to ſay for it, though enough he hath to ſay againſt it; and that is the third thing I would take notice of in this Argument.

Baptiſm is but a Circumſtance, as he is pleaſed often to word it: And *Page* 88. *Onely an outward* SHEW. He may have the heart of Water-Baptiſm that is never Baptized: it is

but a form, (an almoſt nothing:) men are not much better. Is it not enough for you to deſpiſe your brethren, but contempt alſo muſt be thrown upon this precious truth of Chriſt? from whom have you Authority to nick-name any of Chriſt's precepts? is this according to the form of ſound words? will you be wiſe above what is written, and call Commands Circumſtances, only meer ſhews? do you pretend your ſelf a Miniſter of the Goſpel, and dare you thus diſparage Goſpel truths by ſuch low Titles, to diſcharge men of their obedience to them? Verily Sir, what ever you think of your ſelf, I am confident Chriſt will not take this well at your hands.

4. You ſay theſe have the Doctrine of Baptiſm; if they have it, they underſtand it: you ſay it is the death of Chriſt, his Reſurrection, and their intereſt in it: But I conceive in the Doctrine of Baptiſm there is ſome thing

thing elſe that more properly relates to Baptiſm as a Command, which it will be hard for you to prove theſe Unbaptized perſons have.

1. A right Adminiſtration.
2. A right Subject.
3. The right manner of dipping.
4. The right end.

Have theſe you ſpeak of the Doctrine of Baptiſm, as you ſay, and are ſtrangers to, or enemies to theſe Eſſentials of Goſpel-Baptiſm? I think upon ſecond thoughts you will hardly ſtand by it.

5. Who taught you to devide between Chriſt and his Precepts, that you word it at ſuch a rate, that he that hath the one hath that which is better & richer then the other? I had thought that he that hath Chriſt, hath an orderly right to all Chriſt's promiſes, and all Chriſts precepts; & that the precepts of Chriſt are part of the riches which a believer hath

in and by Christ, and ought not to be so slightly represented: He that slightly despiseth his Birth, right of Ordinances, or Church-priviledges will be found to be a profane person as *Esau*, in Gods account, though he thinks it is no Sin to make a mean account of them.

Your Fourth Argument is grounded upon *Romans* 15. 1, 6. *Receive one another to the Glory of God.*

I answer, 1. It was *Paul's* direction to the Church at *Rome*, how they ought to carry it towards their Brethren Church members. And it is no ways likely, that this receiving is a receiving one another into Church-Communion, for they were in before: but by reason of those Jewish differances that was amongst them about meats, and drinks, and days, they were apt to grieve and Judge one another in those indifferent things, and to cast each other out

out of their hearts, having not that Christian respect to each other as they ought; by which God was dishonoured: therefore he exalts them to receive each others into their affections, which would be to the Glory of God.

That the difference amongst the *Romans* was about indifferent things that might, or might not be done, is clear from the 14 Chapter; their differences was not about Baptism, or any New Testament Ordinance, for I have indeavonred to prove them before Baptized: Therefore what you urge from hence comes not neer the matter in question.

2. You make Gods receiving to be the rule for our receiving, which in all case, will not hold: God receives men at that very instant in which they receive his Son, before the fruits of their Faith appear; but so cannot we: God received the thief upon the Cross, but the Church

ought not to receive him till he had given satisfaction by repentance, shewing the fruits of it, for his sinful by-past life: I doubt not but God may receive Infants dying in Infancy, as the fruit of his electing love; but I suppose you your self will not yet, receive them upon that ground.

3. You are pleased to go on in *Page* 91. very rhetorically: *Vain man, think not by the streightness of thine Order in outward and, bodily Conformity to outward & shadowish Circumstances, that thy peace is maintained with God.*

First, By vain man, you mean I suppose the Brethren of the Baptized way, that differ from you in this point: Is this the best Title you have for them? But,

Secondly, You pinch at the streightness of their Order: I never knew streightness in Order to be a crime, but rather a praise. *Paul* rejoyced to behold the Order, *Col.* 2.5. as well as the Faith of the *Colossians*, though

though you despise it. But,

Thirdly, You are pleased to say, it is outward and bodily Conformity to outward and shadowish Circumstances.

Sir, Is outward and bodily conformity become a crime? ought we not to glorifie God with our bodies as well as souls, which are Gods? Is not the whole Man to be improved in the service of God? but you add in outward and shadowish Circumstances; I know you mean Baptism, a Title that was never given (by any sound in the Faith) to any New Testament Ordinances: But you say our peace is not maintained hereby, but by the Blood of the Cross: I know our peace is made for us by the Blood of Christ's Cross, but is not our peace maintained and kept alive in the way of obedience? hath your sincere obedience to the Gospel Commands no influence upon your Conscience,

1 *Cor.* 6. 20.

in the matter of peace? or, is your peace maintained in the way of disobedience? if it be, I fear it is a false peace: I speak now of peace of Conscience.

2. If you mean by peace with God, that which pacifies God, and is the manifest cause of God's being at peace with us: who amongst us ever told you that our peace in that sence is maintained by Baptism? or dare you say that your Faith, or Love, or Obedience to any precept, doth in that sence, either procure, or maintain your peace, in the matter of Justification? If not, you ought not to pare off any part of Gospel-obedience, and render it of so little worth; when we own the whole of what we all do, is altogether too little to be a Peace-Offering for us.

Your Fifth Argument is, *That a failure in Baptism doth not Unchristian us.*

Answ.

Answ. Who ſaith it doth? Perſons ought to be Chriſtians before they are Baptized; and once a Chriſtian, and always a Chriſtian: but in purſuit of this Argument you are pleaſed to rank Water-Baptiſm with eating, or not eating, that if a man do it, he is not the better, or neglect it, he is not the worſe.

Verily Sir, if Gospel-Precepts muſt be ranked with Old Teſtament Ceremonies that are abrogated by the death of Chriſt, I know not upon what account you practice inſtituted Worſhip now, unleſs upon the ſame account as *Paul* p actiſed Circumciſion upon *Timothy*, or ſhaving on others, not as a Command from God, but as a prudential conſideration as to others, which is below that confeſſion, or profeſſion, that hitherto you have made about Baptiſm. What ever your deſign may be, either now, or hereafter.

Your

Your Sixt Argument is, *Edification*, which you say is *greater then agreement in outward things, and contesting for Water-Baptism.*

Answ. Edification is the end of all Communion, but all things must be done in order, orderly. Edification as to Church-Fellowship, being a building up, doth suppose the being of a Church, before they can be thus Edified or built up: But pray you, shew us a Church without Baptism, approved of by the New Testament, and then edifie them as much as you can. But if by Edification be meant the private increase of Grace in one another, in the use of private means, as private Christians in meeting together, how doth the Principle you oppose, hinder that? Indeavour to make men as Holy as you can, that they may be fit for Church-Fellowship, when God shall shew them the orderly way to it, we shall

ſhall never blame you; but you ſay Edification is greater then conteſting for Water-Baptiſm; To which I anſwer,

I had thought that a Preaching and opening Baptiſm, might have been reckoned as a part of our Edification, and we may be as well Edified by rightly knowing and underſtanding that, as by many other Ordinances, eſpecially if it ſignifie ſo much as you ſay it doth. But add,

Why may you not as well ſay that Edification is greater then breaking Bread? then any part of Church rule, or Government? and ſo at once ſhut out all inſtituted Worſhip; for ſomthing you call Edification. Why muſt Water-Baptiſm be the *BUT* that you ſo conſtantly ſhoot at?

3. How comes Conteſting for Water-Baptiſm to be ſo much againſt you? is not the leaſt of truths worth

worth the contending for? or, what need any to trouble themselves, to contest for Water-Baptism: If none of your new Church-members do not contest against it, in principle or practice? which if they do, at whose door shall sinful contention be laid, ours or theirs?

As for your instance of *Aron*, it was not a constant continued forbearance of that part of God's Worship, but a suspending of it for that season, (and perhaps upon Just and Legal grounds, though not expressed,) which made that zealous man, *Moses*, who stoned a man for gathering sticks on the Sabath day; and was a spectator of God's Judgments on *Aron*'s Sons for their Sin:) so easily bear with *Aron* in that matter. *Paul* for a seeming low thing did withstand *Peter* to his face, and blamed him. And for *Eldad* & *Medad* if they did miss in it was but in a Circumstance of place:

place: It appears not, there was any positive Law broken by it; which is the case under our debate, how often so ever you dispisingly call Baptism a Circumstance: neither doth the case of *Hezekiah* reach our case: it was indeed their not being prepared for that service, which was their Sin, and may be too fitly compared to unpreparedness, to the Lords Supper, or other solemn appointments, for which we do not cast, nor keep any out of the Church, it being no denying either in word or practice, of any positive Ordinance; which is that we charge your intended Church-members with.

Your Seventh Argument for Communion with Unbaptized persons, is, *Love*.

Answ. That man that makes affection the rule of his walking, rather then Judgement, it is no wonder to me, if he go out of the way.

We

We can as boldly assert our Love to all the Godly, though Unbaptized, as you; and I think we have not been behind hand to manifest it, either in private Duties of Piety with them, wherein we are agreed; or in works of Charity towards them, in all their sufferings, according to our utmost ability: But must our love to these, indulge them in any act of disobedience? cannot we love their Persons, Parts, Graces, but we must love their Sins, and disorders? I take it to be the highest act of friendship to be faithful to these professors, and to tell them they want this one thing in Gospel order, which ought not to be left undone; and I doubt your favour towards them, in deserying before them one of Christs Commands, as a Circumstance, meer shew, that that may, or may not be done; for which we are neither better nor worse (in your sence) making it no more then eating

eating, or not eating, as men are perſwaded: Is this your faithfulneſs to your friends, that you pretend ſo much love to? I doubt when it comes to be weighed in God's Ballance, it will be found no leſs then Flattery, for which you will be reproved. May I not love a Saint, as a Saint for Chriſt's ſake, unleſs I hold Church-Communion with him? unleſs I countenance him in a breach of Goſpel Order? Nay, if a Child of God fall into Sin, or diſorder, without the due ſence of his Sin, yet I ought to love him: though I am forced to deal with him, and to withdraw from him, yet I am not to count him as an enemy, but admoniſh as a brother in ſome reſpects: and muſt we be Judged to have no love to the perſons under debate, becauſe we are not willing to ſuffer them to ſit down ſatisfied with a lye, inſtead of the truth, a falſe Baptiſm, inſtead of Chriſt's

Christ's appointment, if in that matter *Ephraim* like, they are joyned to an Idol, must I not wait till God shews them that abomination, and yet love them for what of God we see in them?

Your Eighth Argument is from the state of the Church of *Corinth*, who you say are called *Carnal*, for their divisions, and shutting each other out of Communion for greater points, and on higher pretences then that of Water-Baptism.

Answ. It is true, there was divisions in the Church of *Corinth*, for which they are often called Carnal: and their divisions was about greater things then Baptism, I grant: for I believe it was not barely their divisions about persons, but the highest Fundamental Principles, opposed by some of the leaders of those Factions amongst them; as denying the resurrection of the dead; as *Paul* saith

faith some of them did, *Chap.* 15. but whereas you say they shut one another out of Communion for these things, that I find not: (Whatever they might, or ought to do) it is certain they were a Church in order, planted upon Gospel Principles, though afterwards some of them declined from those Principles: and though the Principles about which they might differ, was greater then Baptism, is true, but that without much means, and due waiting for the fruit of that means, they could not shut them out of Communion is as true; and I put it to your self, if any person should offer Communion with you, that deny the Resurrection, would you receive him? but if any person do after receiving deny that, or other Principles, can you immediately shut him out of the Church, without the use of means, and waiting? this seems to me to be

their

their case, which agrees not with the controversie in hand. But you say their divisions was about Persons, *Paul*, *Apollo*, and *Christ*: I do grant their division was about persons, their Teachers; and one was for one, and others for another; but I question whether any of them in this division was for *Paul*, *Apollo*, or *Christ*; but rather for others in opposition to them who were true Ministers: My reason is, because *Paul* tells us that what he had said of himself and *Apollo*, was in a Figure, 1 *Cor.* 4. 6. not properly, but doth modestly aply the business to himself and others, as though their divisions was about them, when it was not about them, but others that did oppose them, namely the false Apostles, or Notional Teachers of that Church.

Secondly, You tell us, the great divisions of *Corinth* was helped forward

ward by Water-Baptiſm: a very high charge againſt this great truth: It is no wonder you lay diviſions at our doors, when Baptiſm it ſelf muſt be accuſed as a make-bate, or a furtherer of diviſions amongſt the Saints: Oh! let the heavens bluſh at the inſolency of this man of words; that ever Chriſt ſhould appoint an Ordinance ſo highly detrimental to the peace of Saints. But how doth it appear that Baptiſm hath a hand in theſe diviſions? becauſe *Paul* imitates they were not Baptized in his name: a good Argument to provoke to union; and to take them off from doting upon thoſe Factious leaders amongſt them; by whom it is like they were moſt of them Baptized, to let them know they were not Baptized in the names of men, but of Chriſt. But wherein lies the force of this mans Argument againſt Baptiſm,

as to its place, worth, or continuance? Why? it is urged from two grounds.

First, Because *Paul* knew not that he Baptized any but those he names; which argues, *he made not so great a matter of Baptism as some do now adays, for then he would have heeded it better, and made more Conscience thereof, then so lightly pass it over*: What must the blessed Apostles Conscience be called in question about one of Christ's appointments? and must it be supposed he is so negligent in this matter? and only because he knew not who of the *Corinths* he had Baptized. Is this so demonstrable a ground? Sir, if one should ask you how many you have Baptized in the Course of your Ministry, can you give an account? I think not, (unless you have kept a Record by you, of the persons, that your works might be heard

heard of to your praiſe, as occaſion ſerves;) which I ſuppoſe few Miniſters do, neither did *Paul*, it ſeems by his own words. I could tell you of a perſon that is zealous for Baptiſm in the ſence that you oppoſe, and makes Conſcience of it, as one of Chriſt's Precepts, to that degree which you diſalow of; and yet for thoſe few that he hath Baptized, far ſhort of what *Paul*, or you may have done, and yet he knows not, remembers not, who of the Church he walks with, that he hath Baptized, much leſs the number, or names of them he hath Baptized elſe where, and yet but one of the meaneſt diſpencers of Baptiſm, who hath had leſs ſhare in that bleſſed work, then many others he knows amongſt us. That *Paul* did firſt gather and plant the Church of *Corinth*, is clear; but that the many that were added to that populous peo-

ple,

ple, might be Baptized by the teaching brethren amongſt themſelves, is more then probable, and therefore well might *Paul* ſay, *He knew not, or did not remember who he had Baptized amongſt them.*

But your Second ground is from *Paul's* thanking God, and telling us he was not ſent to Baptize, but to Preach the Goſpel: Doth this prove that *Paul* ſlighted Baptiſm? I think not, as will afterwards appear.

That *Paul* did Baptize ſome of them, and many others, is not to be queſtioned, becauſe expreſſed: That *Paul* did any thing in this or other Ordinances, but what he had a Commiſſion for, may not be preſumed: his meaning then muſt be, that he was not only, or mainly ſent to Baptize, but Preach, as the great work he was to attend upon. Note, he doth not ſay he was not ſent to Preach Baptiſm, but

but not mainly to Baptize: He had the same Commission to Preach Baptism, as Faith; and he could not be true to his trust, if he should shun to declare that part of the Counsel of God, as occasion served, and required. And yet though he Preached Faith and Baptism, he might Baptize but few of them that were perswaded to obedience by his Ministry, but the bare dispencing that ordinance, might be by any gifted Brother, called to that work.

Ananias, a certain Disciple, Baptized *Paul*; (and not an Apostle.) *Peter* commanded Cornelius, and those that were with him, to be Baptized: but the Text doth not say Peter did it; it might be done by some of the Brethren that came with him: neither can it reasonably be supposed that the 3000. converted by *Peter*'s Sermon, *Act.* 2. was all Baptized by him, or the

Apostles only; but it is very like they had many administrators, which doth not at all intrench upon the great Commission of Christ, but is found in it; it being given to Preaching Disciples, as Preaching Disciples; and all Preaching Disciples have authority from thence, to Preach and Baptize; (these being properly no Church-Ordinances) though in order to it.

Your Ninth Argument is, *That by denying Communion with Unbaptized persons we take from them their priviledge to which they are born.*

Answ. We take from them nothing; but we keep them from a disorderly practice of Gospel Ordinances: we offer them their priviledge in the way of Gospel order, as all the Scripture Saints received their Priviledges. But if any will find, and force another way into the Sheepfold, then by following the footsteps of the Flocks, we

we have no such custome, nor the Churches of God, you according to your old manner of confidence affirm. Drink *ye all of this*? Is this intailed to Faith, and not Baptism? It is soon said, but never yet proved, it is neither intailed by Precept, Promise, or president, to Faith, without Baptism, that ever yet can be shewed: Nay, it is most apparent, that this new way of fellowship was not from the beginning, but Baptism went before, as a Simbol of our new birth: and breaking bread followed after, as the spiritual nourishment of Christ's new-born Babes.

As for your Eighteen Inferances, or Absurdities drawn for our Principle and Practice, they are in themselves so rediculous, so topful of ignorance, or prejudice; and are in themselves such a heap of unheard of reproaches, that deserve no other answer then con-

cempt; they carrying their self contradiction in their own bowels. I dare commit this cause to the worst of our Enemies, and doubt not they themselves being Judges, would clear us in the things laid to our charge; that none but your self could, ever find an innocent truth, big with so many monstrous absurdities, as you do. You have carried it like one of *Machevel's* Schollers, to purpose, *Throw dirt enough, and some of it will be sure to stick.* And the last of all looks with so dreadful a countenance, that it hath a tendency, to provoke, not only all other professors, but all sorts of persons, to shun us, as well as of Principle, as that which is ruining to mankind in general; that they may upon that account (if true) eye us, as the most pernicious varment under heaven; persons made to be taken and destroyed. Can you so confidently affirm, that

this

this principle and practice is the cause of all our late Judgements. Sir, it is well for us, that you are none of the Kings Chaplains; or if you were, that his Majesty had not an ear to hear, or a heart to believe such unheard of reproaches as these are; for if he did, he could do no less, then expulse such vipers, that have been the death of so many hundred thousands of his subjects, as your devilish suggestions seems to insinuate, not only out of the Land, but out of the World.

Sir, who made you so privy to the secrets of Gods Judgements, that you must assign this alone, as the cause of (not some but) all the Judgements that have befallen us? And is not this high charge a prouded-, presumptious, impeaching of the Justice of God? Shall not the Judge of all the earth do righteously? *Gen* 19. *Will*

he slay the innocent with the guilty? Are there not millions lately swept into the Grave, and buried in the great deeps, that never heard, directly, or indirectly of the controversie between you, and us, nor knew nothing of the form or order of Gods house; and must their ruine lye at our doors? No wonder Sir, that you deal so severely with us, since the Righteous proceeds of the great God, have such a hidden cause assigned to them, as though the times prophanes, Superstition, Blasphemy, and Atheism, hath no hand in our late Judgements, but the load of all, must be laid upon that which so few that suffered, are concerned in. The Lord Judge between us, and this accuser; to whom we shall say no more, but, *The Lord rebuke thee.*

Your Tenth and last Argument hath so little reason, and so much of confusion in it, that it renders it self unworthy of an answer. *That the World may wonder at our carriage to these Unbaptized persons, in keeping them out of Communion*, is your last Argument.

Answ. I grant, the World are in some cases Judges of our conversation; and it becomes us to carry it well in those things, wherein they are capable to be Judges: but I deny, that the World are proper Judges of the grounds of our Profession, or Communion, as to Church-fellowship: these things are out of their sight; and they do oftener Judge them that walk closest in their duty, then they that are for the greatest liberty. All that the enemy could find against *Daniel*, was in the matters of his God, (in the business of Worship,) which the World

are uncapable to Judge of: And therefore what you say, as to their reproaches, doth clearly vanish; and if you eye that you may preach and pray, especially Baptize no more, which I perceive you have no great zeal for.

I shall now take liberty to add some Arguments to Justifie our Principle and Practice, against all that you have said to the contrary.

THe Question is, *whether Unbaptized persons have been, or ought to be members of Gospel Churches.*

I answer, *They ought not to be*: for these Reasons.

First, Because the great Commission of Christ, *Mat.* 28. (from which

which all persons have their Authority for their Ministry, (if any Authority at all) doth clearly direct the contrary by that Commission. Ministers are, first to Disciple, and then Baptize them, to made Disciples; and afterward teach them to observe all that Christ had commanded, as to other Ordinances of Worship. If Ministers have no other authority to teach them other parts of Gospel Worship, before they believe and are Baptized, it may be strongly supposed, they are not to admit them to other Ordinances, before they have passed the first injoyned in that Commission.

Secondly, That the order of Christ's Commission, as well as the matter therein contained, to be observed, may easily be concluded from Gods severity towards them that sought him not according to

disorder, 1 *Chron.* 15:13. Was God so exact with his people then, that all things, to a pin, must be according to the pattern in the Mount? *Heb.* 7-16, and 9, 10. whose Worship then compartively, to the Gospels, was but after the Law of a carnal Commandment: and can it be supposed, he should be so indifferent, now to leave men to their own liberty, to time and place his appointments contrary to what he hath given an express rule for, in his word, as before shewed, *Ezekiel* 44. 7, 9. 10. *It was the Priests Sin formerly to bring the Uncircumcised in heart and flesh into his house.*

Thirdly, The practice of the first Gospel Ministers, with them that first trusted in Christ, discovers the truth of what I assert. Certainly they that lived at the Spring-head, or Fountain of truth, and had the Law from Christ's own mouth, knew

knew the meaning of his Commission, better then we: But their constant practice, in conformity to that Commission, all along the Acts of the Apostles, clearly discovers that they never arrived to such a Latitude as men plead for now adays: *They that gladly received the Word was Baptized, and they (yea they only) was received to the Church,* Acts 2.

Fourthly, None of the Scripture-Saints ever attempted this Church-Priviledge, before Baptism, (if they did, let it be shewn:) the Eunuch first desired Baptism, before any thing else: *Paul* was first Baptized, before he did assay to joyn with the Church: our Lord Christ, the great example of the New Testament, entred not upon his publique Ministry, much less any other Gospel Ordinance of Worship, till he was Baptized.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, If Christ himself was made manifest, as the sent of God, by Baptism, as appears *Mark* 1.9,10. shew why may not Baptism as the first fruit of Faith, and the first step of Gospel obedience, as to instituted Worship, be a manifesting, discovering Ordinance upon others, who thus follow Christ's steps?

Sixthly, If Baptism be in any sence, any part of the Foundation of a Church, as to order, *Heb.* 6.1,2. it must have a place here, or no where. Why are those things called first Principles, if not first to be believed and practised? Why are they rendred by the learned, as the *A B C* of a Christian, and the beginnings of Christianity, milk for babes, if it be no matter whether Baptism be practised or no? If it be said Water-Baptism be not there intended, let them shew me how many Baptis-

ms

mes there are besides Water-Baptisme: Can you build, and leave out a stone in the Foundation? I intend not Baptism as a foundation any other way, but respecting order; and it is either intended for that, or nothing.

Seventhly, If *Paul* knew the *Galathians*, upon the account of Charity, no other way to be the Sons of God by Faith, but by this part of their obedience, as he seems to import; then the same way we may Judge of the truth of mens profession of Faith, when it shews it self by this self same obedience, *Gal.* 3. 26, 27. Baptism being an obligation to all following duties.

Eighthly, If being Baptized into Christ, be a putting on of Christ, as *Paul* expresses, then they have not put on Christ in that

sence

sence he means, that are not Baptized. If this putting on of Christ do not respect the visibility of Christianity, assign something else as its signification, great mens servants are known by their Masters Liveries, so are Gospel believers by this Livery of Water Baptism, that all that first trusted in Christ, submitted to: which is in it self, as much as an Obligation to all Gospel obedience, as Circumcision was, to keep the whole Law.

Ninthly, If it were commendable in them of *Thessalonica*, that they followed the foot-steps of the Church of *Judah*, who, it appeares, observed this Order, of adding Baptized believers to the Church, then they that have found out another way of making Church-members, 1 *Thes.* 2. 14. are not by that rule praise-worthy, but rather

ther to be blamed: It is not what was since in corrupted times, but that which was from the beginning: the first Churches was the purest pattern.

Tenthly, If so be that any of the members of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Colosse*, *Rome*, *Romans.* 6. or them that *Peter Colos.* 2. writes to, were not *1 Cor.* 15. Baptized, then *Paul's* Arguments for the Resurrection to them, or to press them to Holiness, from that ground, was out a doors, and altogether needless: Nay, it bespeaks his ignorance; and *1 Pet.* 3. 12. throws contempt upon the Spirits Wisdom, by which he *Heb.* 6. wrote, if that must be asserted as a ground to provoke them to such an end, which had no being; and if all the members of all those

thoſe Churches were Baptized; why ſhould any plead for an exemption from Baptiſm, for any Church-members now?

Eleventhly, If Unbaptized perſons muſt be received into the Church, only, becauſe they are believers; though they deny Baptiſm, then why may not others plead for the like priviledge, that are negligent in any other Goſpel Ordinance of Worſhip, from the ſame ground, of want of light, let it be what it will. So then, as the Conſequence of this Princip!, Churches may be made up of viſible Sinners, inſtead of viſible Saints.

Twelfthly, Why ſhould profeſſors have more light in breaking of bread, then Baptiſm? (that this muſt be ſo urged for their excuſe) hath God been more

more ſparing in making out his mind, in the one, rather then the other? Is there more precepts, or preſidents for the Supper, then Baptiſm? hath God been ſo bountiful, in making out himſelf about the Supper, that few or none, that own Ordinances, ſcruple it; and muſt Baptiſm be ſuch a Rock of offence to profeſſors, that very few will ſeriouſly enquire after it, or ſubmit to it? hath not mans wiſdom interpoſed, to darken this part of Gods Counſel, by which profeſſors ſeem willingly led, though againſt ſo many plain commands and examples, written as with a Sun beam, that he that runs may read; and muſt an advocate be intertained to plead for ſo groſe a piece of ignorance, that the meaneſt babes of the firſt Goſpel times were never guilty of?

Thirteenthly, If obedience must discover the truth of a man's Faith to others? why must Baptism be shut out, as if it were no part of Gospel obedience? is there no precept for this practice, that it must be thus despised, as a matter of little use? or shall one of Christs precious commands be blotted out of the Copy of a Christians obedience, to make way for a Church-Fellowship of mans devising?

Fourteenthly, If the Baptism of *John*, was so far honoured, and dignified, that they that did submit to it, are said to Justifie God; and they that did not, are said, *Luke* 7. to reject his Counsel, against themselves, so that their receiving, or rejecting the whole Doctrine of God, by *John*, hath its demonstration from this single practice: and is there not as much

to

to be said of the Baptism of Christ? unless you will say it is [illegible] in worth and use to that of John's.

I add no more, but these few Queries, which I commmit to your most serious consideration.

Some

Some Queries.

1. ASk your heart whether popularity, and applause of variety of professors, be not in the bottom of what you have said; that hath been your snare, to pervert the streight way of the Lord, and to lead others into a path, wherein we can find none of the foot-steps of the Flocks in the first time?

2. Have you dealt brotherly, or like a Christian, to throw so much dirt upon your Brethren, in Print, in the face of the World, when you had opportunity to converse

with

n of reputation, amongst
bre Printing; being a-
wed the liberty by them, at
the same time, for you to speak
amongst them?

3. Doth your carriage answer the Law of Love, or Civility, when the Brethren used means to send to you for a conference, and their Letter was received by you, that you should go out again from the City, after knowledge of their desires, and not vouchsafe a meeting with them, when the Glory of God, and the vindication of so many Churches, is concerned?

4. Is it not the Spirit of *Diophrites* of old, in you, *Who*

loved

loved to b
3. *John* 9. 10. *preheminen*
you are
as to keep out all the Brethre
that are not of your mind in this matter, from having any entertainment in the Churches, or meetings to which you belong, though you your self have not been denyed the like liberty, amongst them that are contrary minded to you? is this the way of your retaliation? or are you affraid lest the truth should in this matter invade your Quarters?

6. Is there no contempt cast upon the Brethren, who desired your satisfaction, that at the same time, when you had opportunity to speak to them, in-

hat, you commit
etter to others, by
flection upon them?

6. Did not your presumption prompt you to provoke them to Printing, in your Letter to them, when they desired to be found in no such practice, least the enemies of truth should take advantage by it?

7. Whether your Principle & Practice is not equally against others, as well as us? *viz.* Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Independent, who are all of our side, for our practice (though they differ with us about the subject of Baptism:) do you delight to have your hand against every man?

FINIS.

In the Epistle, Page
President. p. 8. l. 17.
Elie, p. 16. l. 12. r. death of
l. 4. r. exhorts.

---

1. SYmtomes of growth, and decay
Of godliness, in eighty signs of a
living and dying Christian, with the
causes of decay, and remedies for re-
covery. The second Edition much
enlarged, with the Addition also of
twenty signs largely improved.

2. A new and useful Concordance
to the Holy Bible, according to the
last Translation, containing the most
material Scriptures, in the Line &
Margent of the old and new Testa-
ment, together with the chief ac-
ceptations of special words, with
notes to distinguish the promises,
commands, and threatnings, being
plainer, and much larger then any
of this Volume yet extant, in Octavo
and Twelves: Also to be had bound
up with the Bible, in both Volumes.
By Mr. *Vavasor Powell*.